

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed December 17, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration and re-examination of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and below remarks.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Hartsell et al (U.S. Patent Application 20020065864).

#### **Hartsell:**

Hartsell is directed at a system and method for resource tracking in information managed environments. For example, Hartsell describes, in the abstract:

“...Methods and systems for providing differentiated service that may be employed, for example, to deliver content or services in a network environment. Differentiated services that may be so delivered include both differentiated information service that may be implemented, for example, at the system and/or processing level, as well as differentiated business service that may be implemented, for example, to differentiate information exchange between different network entities such as different network provider entities, different network user entities, etc. The methods and systems may include or facilitate provisioning of system service parameters such as service level agreement ("SLA") policies and may be employed in network computing system environments to enable differentiated service provisioning, for example, in accordance with business objectives...”

In contrast, the present invention allows a user to configure a system, using a user interface and information regarding the target workload, response time or other utilization requirements. As shown in Figure 7, a user may specify a source configuration (Source Boxes), and a number of target boxes (202). Performance information regarding the source configuration and number of boxes is used to select components of a target configuration. No such structure is shown or suggested by Hartsell.

Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly recite patentable aspects of the invention. For example, Claim 1, as amended, now recites “...*A method for determining a configuration for a target data storage system ....receiving, from a user interface, **identifiers of one or more source data storage systems** ...receiving utilization or response time data related to the one or more source data storage systems receiving performance characteristics of work performed on the one or more source data storage systems ... **receiving, from the user interface, a number of boxes to be included in a target data storage system; and ... determining and displaying a configuration for the target data storage system, wherein components of the target data storage system are selected in response to the utilization and response time data, the number of boxes and the performance characteristics.***”

Dependent claims 2-8 serve to further narrow claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. However, several of the dependent claims also include limitations that are neither shown nor described in Hartsell. For example, claim 2, as amended, now recites “...*receiving, from the user interface, a change to the number of boxes in the target data storage system; and reconfiguring the target data storage system in response to the change to the number of boxes, the utilization and response time and the performance characteristics...*”

Hartsell neither describes nor suggests such a feature. Accordingly, for this additional reason, it is requested that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and is allowable for at least the reason that Hartsell neither describes nor suggests a user interface that enables a user to select a source configuration, a number of boxes in a target configuration, and wherein the user interface displays the target configuration to the user. Dependent claims 10-16 serve to further limit claim 9 and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 9.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants' believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (508) 293-6275.

Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 17, 2008 \_\_\_\_\_ /Lindsay G. McGuinness/  
Lindsay G. McGuinness (Reg. 38,549)  
Attorney for Applicants  
EMC Corporation  
Office of General Counsel  
176 South Street  
Hopkinton, MA 01748  
Telephone: (508) 293-6275  
Facsimile: (508) 293-7189